

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/628,843 .	07/28/2003	Leonard S. Schultz	6971.02	5820		
	7590 03/08/2007 David E. Bruhn			EXAMINER		
DORSEY & W	DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP Intellectual Property Department 50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1500		YABUT, DIANE D			
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Minneapolis, M	N 55402-1498		3734			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			03/08/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/628,843	SCHULTZ, LEONARD S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diane Yabut	3734	

20.0.0 u.og 0. u.opp 0 u.o. =	Examiner	Art Offic					
	Diane Yabut	3734					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date	a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two montl	ns of the date of				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below),					
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or 							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		P. Aber				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ worlded below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a (1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
	•						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to Claim 29 and 34 would require further consideration .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The prior art of record reads on all the limitations of the claims, such as Lee teaching a closure for a lumen that structurally impedes the lumen while still allowing some flow - as the present invention allows flow of the biological bonding agent -- and therefore the arguments are not persuasive. Applicant generally argues that none of the prior art of record reads on the limitation of a plug defining a plurality of openings and being configured and dimensionsed to occlude flow through the lumen. However, the examiner's rejection is maintained since the plug of Lee occludes flow - albeit still allows some flow of material as does the present invention -- and therefore reads on this limitation.

MICHAEL J. HAYES SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER